The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. BILIRAKIS] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. BILIRAKIS addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. SKAGGS] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. SKAGGS addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Florida [Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from North Carolina [Mrs. CLAYTON] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mrs. CLAYTON addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

SUPPORT AN ENLARGED NAFTA TO ENSURE COMPETITIVENESS OF AMERICAN EXPORTERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BEREUTER] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, today I want to continue the discussion which began in a joint subcommittee hearing of the House International Relations Committee on trade issues regarding Chile and other Latin American countries in light of the North American Free Trade Act [NAFTA] experience.

No doubt, we will continue to hear a plethora of statistics and anecdotes about the benefits and costs of NAFTA as well as increasing information about the benefits and costs of Chile's possible accession to that agreement. As a Member, I strongly supported NAFTA. Now, I strongly support Chile's accession to NAFTA. In fact, this Member said at the time, and will repeat it here today, that in a straightforward economic decision, it would have been more appropriate to accept Chile into a free-trade agreement with the United States even before Mexico because of Chile's dramatic economic progress and liberalization.

It is very easy to get lost in all the statistics about the benefits of NAFTA or Chile's accession. But those statistics don't reveal one thing. One should ask: ''What would have happened if we had not passed NAFTA?''

There can be no doubt that many American companies have relocated to Mexico recently. Undoubtedly, many Americans have lost their jobs to cheaper Mexican labor. But that does not mean that many Americans would have kept their jobs if we had not adopted NAFTA. No, instead, Americans would have lost many low-wage jobs to Southeast Asia, South Asia, and other parts of Central and South America. This situation has been greatly exacerbated by the peso crisis in Mexico which itself, this Member emphasizes, was in no way caused by the NAFTA agreement.

Mr. Speaker, when this body courageously adopted the Uruguay Round implementing legislation, this Member said that many opponents of that historic trade legislation were in essence saying, ''Stop the world, I want to get off.'' Well, this Member stands by that comment and believes it still applies here today.

The simple truth is that the United States, and the American people, have no good economic choice but to push for expansion of NAFTA gradually and appropriately to the entire Western Hemisphere or risk being excluded from a rapidly liberalizing world economy. Economic integration and trade liberalization is occurring in nearly every part of the world including Europe, Asia, and South America.

For example, the European Union [EU] has already created the world's largest free-trade zone and has recently expanded this block by adding three members of the European Free Trade Association (Austria, Finland, and Sweden). The EU's single market includes 369 million consumers and a gross domestic product [GDP] of about $6.3 trillion (1993). This ''Fortress Europe,'' as some call it, is seeking to add the low-wage Eastern European economies of Poland, Hungary, the Czech Republic and Slovakia by the year 2000 and the North African and Middle Eastern countries of Morocco, Algeria, Libya, Tunisia, Egypt, Jordan, Syria, Lebanon and Israel by the year 2010. Together, this free-trade zone of low-wage labor Eastern European and Mediterranean countries and such high-tech, high-wage economies of the EU as the countries of Germany, France, and the United Kingdom represent a very formidable competitor to U.S. businesses and service industries which are attempting to compete in the new world economy.

Similarly, East Asian countries have begun the process of integrating their economies through such regional free-trade groups as the Asia Pacific Economic Cooperation [APEC], which recently agreed to establish free trade in the region by 2020 for all of its 18 members, and the Association of Southeast Asian Nations [ASEAN], which currently has seven members but is seeking to incorporate other countries such as Vietnam, Cambodia, Laos and Burma. ASEAN has rapidly become the world's largest regional trade area (with over 400 million people) and its members recently announced they would lower their tariffs from 0–5 percent shortly after the year 2000.

If the United States fails to continue to insist on its inclusion in these regional groups, supporters of the East Asia Economic Caucus (ASEAN plus China, Japan, and South Korea), which has been proposed by the outspoken Malaysian Prime Minister Mr. Mahathir, may be successful in excluding the United States from Asia and the Pacific region—the fastest growing market in the world.

Not to be left out of trade liberalization, South and Central America and the Caribbean have recently fragmented into several regional free-trade groups including:

Andean Pact: Bolivia, Colombia, Ecuador, Peru, and Venezuela.

Mercosur or Southern Common Market: Argentina, Brazil, Paraguay, Uruguay.

Central American Common Market: El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras, Nicaragua, Costa Rica.

Caricom: Antigua, Barbuda, Bahamas, Barbados, Belize, Dominica, Grenada, Guyana, Jamaica, Montserrat, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent, the Grenadines, Trinidad, Tobago.

Clearly, the United States will suffer economically, politically, and strategically if it chooses to isolate itself from global and regional trade liberalization efforts. History is replete with examples of countries, like China, who turned inward instead of facing the difficult but necessary challenges of adapting to new circumstances, and therefore greatly suffered.

With only 250 million people, the United States cannot afford to refuse to trade with emerging markets in the world's developing countries. Through the year 2025, developing countries are expected to account for 95 percent of the world's population growth. More staggering is the fact that only 10 markets—those of Mexico, Brazil, Argentina, Poland, Turkey, China, South Korea, Indonesia, India, and South Africa will produce one-half of the world's goods and services by the year 2010, but will account for $1 trillion in incremental U.S. exports during that same period.

Mr. Speaker, this Member strongly believes Americans can compete to sell their innovative products and services anywhere in the world provided they are given a fair and equal opportunity without excessive Government interference. Consequently, I vigorously oppose unilaterally surrendering these future markets to our industrialized competitors in the Asia and Pacific region and in Western Europe by isolating ourselves from regional and global economic liberalization. Accordingly, this Member urges his colleagues to support free-trade agreements, such as an enlarged NAFTA, which help ensure that American exporters will be able to compete on a level playing field.

☐ 1915

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WELDON of Florida). Under a previous